

SUSSEX-AST 92/6-1; LANC-TH 5-92
(June 1992)

COBE, Gravitational Waves, Inflation and Extended Inflation

Andrew R. Liddle[†] and David H. Lyth^{*}

[†]*Astronomy Centre,
Division of Physics and Astronomy,
University of Sussex,
Brighton BN1 9QH. U. K.*

^{*}*School of Physics and Materials,
Lancaster University,
Lancaster LA1 4YB. U. K.*

Abstract

We analyse the implications for inflationary models of the cosmic microwave background (cmb) anisotropy measured by COBE. Vacuum fluctuations during inflation generate an adiabatic density perturbation, and also gravitational waves. The ratio of these two contributions to the cmb anisotropy is given for an arbitrary slow-roll inflaton potential. Results from the IRAS/QDOT and POTENT galaxy surveys are used to normalise the spectrum of the density perturbation on the scale $20h^{-1}$ Mpc, so that the COBE measurement on the scale 10^3h^{-1} Mpc provides a lower bound on the spectral index n . For ‘power law’ and ‘extended’ inflation, gravitational waves are significant and the bound is $n > 0.84$ at the 2-sigma level. For ‘natural’ inflation, gravitational waves are negligible and the constraint is weakened to $n > 0.70$, at best marginally consistent with a recent proposal for explaining the excess clustering observed in the APM galaxy survey. Many versions of extended inflation, including those based on the Brans–Dicke theory, are ruled out, because they require $n \lesssim 0.75$ in order that bubbles formed at the end of inflation should not be observed now in the cmb.

E-mail addresses: arl @ uk.ac.sussex.starlink ; d.lyth @ uk.ac.lancaster

Final version, to appear, Physics Letters B

In this note we discuss the implications of the COBE measurement of the anisotropy of the cosmic microwave background [1]. First we consider only the contribution of the density perturbation (Sachs–Wolfe effect). The spectrum of the density perturbation is normalised on the scale $20h^{-1}$ Mpc using results from the IRAS/QDOT and POTENT galaxy surveys. The COBE measurements constrain the spectrum on the scale 10^3h^{-1} Mpc, and therefore constrain the index $1 - n$ of its assumed power-law scale dependence. We then include the effect of gravitational waves, calculated along with the Sachs-Wolfe effect in various inflationary models. Our most dramatic result is that many versions of extended inflation seem to be ruled out.

We define the spectrum of the matter density contrast $\delta = \delta\rho/\rho$, evaluated at the present epoch, as $\mathcal{P}_\rho(k) = V(k^3/2\pi^2)\langle|\delta_{\mathbf{k}}|^2\rangle$ where $\delta_{\mathbf{k}} = V^{-1} \int e^{-ik\cdot x} \delta(x) d^3x$ is the Fourier coefficient in a box of volume V and the brackets denote the average over a small region of k -space. The density contrast, averaged over a randomly placed sphere of radius R , has a mean square given by

$$\sigma^2(R) = \int_0^\infty W^2(kR) \mathcal{P}_\rho(k) \frac{dk}{k} \quad (1)$$

where the window function W is given in [2, 3]. The scale $k^{-1} \sim R$ dominates the integral.

On scales $k^{-1} \gtrsim 10h^{-1}$ Mpc the density contrast is still evolved linearly. (As usual h is the Hubble parameter H_0 in units of $100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, and we take $h = .5$.) Its spectrum is of the form [2, 3],

$$\mathcal{P}_\rho = \delta_H^2(k) T^2(k) \left(\frac{k}{H_0} \right)^4 \quad (2)$$

Up to a gauge dependent numerical factor the primeval spectrum is of the same form with $T = 1$, so it is specified by δ_H^2 . The transfer function $T(k)$ is practically equal to 1 on scales $k^{-1} \gg 100$ Mpc. On smaller scales it depends on the nature of the dark matter, but for the scales $k^{-1} > 20h^{-1}$ Mpc that we are considering the dependence is weak. We use the cold dark matter transfer function parametrised in [4].

We assume that on scales of interest there is a power law spectrum, $\delta_H^2 \propto k^{n-1}$ for some spectral index n , and ask what departures there may be from the scale-invariant value $n = 1$ advocated by Harrison and Zel’dovich.

1. Normalisation at $20h^{-1}$ Mpc.

Following Efstathiou, Bond and White [5] and Taylor and Rowan-Robinson [6] in their treatment of the COBE data, we normalise the density contrast $\delta N/N$ on a scale of roughly $20h^{-1}$ Mpc using the QDOT/IRAS galaxy map [7] and the POTENT peculiar velocity map [8]. The average number density contrast of IRAS galaxies in a randomly placed cube with sides of $30h^{-1}$ Mpc has rms [9] 0.46 ± 0.07 . We have doubled the quoted uncertainty, corresponding presumably to the 2-sigma level which we adopt throughout. To simplify the subsequent analysis, we pretend that the

result applies to a sphere of the same volume as the cube, ie., to a sphere of radius $19h^{-1}$ Mpc.

This result is converted into a result for the mass density contrast σ , on the assumption that $\delta N/N = b_I \delta \rho / \rho$, where the IRAS bias factor b_I is assumed to be position independent. According to [6], three independent dynamical estimates of b_I give respectively 1.23 ± 0.23 , 1.16 ± 0.23 and 1.2 ± 0.1 . As they use the same data the errors on these numbers cannot be combined statistically, but it seems reasonable to take as something like a 2-sigma result $b_I = 1.2 \pm 0.3$. This gives

$$\sigma(19h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}) = 0.38 \pm 0.11 \quad (3)$$

For ease of comparison with other work, one specifies the normalisation by giving the bias factor $b_8 \equiv \sigma^{-1}(8h^{-1} \text{ Mpc})$, where σ is the linearly evolved quantity calculated with the cold dark matter transfer function. We emphasise that this is just a way of giving the result, the present paper assuming nothing about what goes on below the $20h^{-1}$ Mpc scale. The result corresponding to Eq. (3) can be accurately parametrised as

$$b_8 = (1.1 \pm .3) \left(\frac{2.9 - n}{1.9} \right)^{2/3} \quad (4)$$

(cf a similar result in [5]).

2. The effect of the density perturbation on COBE.

The cosmic microwave background anisotropy observed by COBE probes scales $\gtrsim 10^3$ Mpc, corresponding to the angular resolution $\sim 10^0$. Because of the ‘cosmic variance’ problem mentioned later, we focus on the lower end of this range. Specifically, we use the result that the anisotropy $\delta T/T$ (excluding the dipole) smeared by a 10^0 full-width at half-maximum Gaussian window has the rms value [1] $\sigma_T(10^0) = (1.1 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-5}$. We have doubled the quoted uncertainty to obtain a 2-sigma quantity. In terms of the multipoles $a_{\ell m}$ defined by $\delta T/T = \sum a_{\ell m} Y_{\ell m}(\theta, \phi)$, one has $\sigma_T^2(10^0) = 2 \sum_{\ell=2}^{\infty} A_{\ell}^2 F_{\ell}$, where $A_{\ell}^2 = \sum_m |a_{\ell m}|^2 / 4\pi$ and the filter function is $[4, 10] F_{\ell} = .5 \exp[(-4.25\pi\ell/180)^2]$. Cosmological perturbation theory gives the expectation value of A_{ℓ}^2 for a randomly placed observer in the form

$$\langle A_{\ell}^2 \rangle = \langle A_{\ell}^2 |_{\rho} \rangle + \langle A_{\ell}^2 |_g \rangle \quad (5)$$

where the first term is the contribution of the density contrast (Sachs–Wolfe effect) and the second term is the contribution of gravitational waves.¹ The first term is [11]

$$\langle A_{\ell}^2 |_{\rho} \rangle = \frac{2\ell + 1}{4} \int_0^{\infty} j_{\ell}^2(2k/H_0) \delta_H^2(k) \frac{dk}{k} \quad (6)$$

¹In both this expression and in Eq. (2) for $\mathcal{P}_{\rho}$ we are neglecting any contributions from a primeval isocurvature density perturbation, strings, textures and so on. Any such contribution will strengthen our conclusion if it contributes more to the cmb anisotropy than it does to the density perturbation on the scale $20h^{-1}$ Mpc, and weaken it if the converse is true.

For a power-law spectrum it becomes [12, 13]

$$\langle A_{\ell}^2 |_{\rho} \rangle = \frac{1}{8} \left[\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \ell(\ell+1) \frac{\Gamma((3-n)/2) \Gamma(\ell+(n-1)/2)}{\Gamma((4-n)/2) \Gamma(\ell+(5-n)/2)} \right] \frac{2\ell+1}{\ell(\ell+1)} \delta_H^2(H_0/2) \quad (7)$$

For $n = 1$ the square bracket is equal to 1. For $\ell \gg 1$ and $\ell \gg |n|$ it can be replaced by 1 if δ_H is evaluated on the scale $k \simeq \ell H_0/2$ which dominates the integral.

The variance (mean square deviation) from this expectation value, giving the uncertainty on the predicted result for our particular position, is called the cosmic variance. It can be calculated on the assumption that the probability distribution of each multipole is Gaussian (which is the case for the inflationary models considered here), and it is large for low multipoles, falling rapidly as ℓ increases. One can readily calculate, assuming the probabilities are independent, that the cosmic variance for fluctuations on 10^0 is only 10% [1, 12], which when combined in quadrature with the observational rms uncertainty increases it from 17% to 20%. We ignore the cosmic variance here, but note that it will dominate the observational uncertainty when the latter is reduced by more than a factor of 2.

Using Eq. (7) we have calculated the density contribution to the 10^0 anisotropy, and deduced the normalisation of its spectrum on the assumption that other contributions are negligible. Expressed in terms of b_8 the result is

$$b_8 = (.95_{-.25}^{+.55}) \exp[2.62(1-n)] \quad (8)$$

where as always the uncertainties are 2-sigma. Combining this result with the IRAS normalisation Eq. (4) determines n . The central value is close to one, and the range allowed by stretching each normalisation to its 2-sigma limit is $0.70 < n < 1.27$. This result may be compared with the one derived by the COBE group from their data alone, which at the 1-sigma level is $n = 1.1 \pm .5$. The weakness of the latter result is due partly to the fact that only one decade of scales (10^3 Mpc to the horizon) is used instead of the two decades used to obtain the former result, and partly to the large cosmic variance in the upper part of this decade.

In an earlier publication [14] we advocated a value $n \simeq 0.6$ to fit the APM galaxy correlation function. The bound just derived is at best marginally compatible with such a proposal, and we have yet to consider the effect of gravitational waves.

3. Inflation and gravitational waves.

Given an inflaton potential which leads to slow-roll inflation, one can calculate the spectrum $\mathcal{P}_g$ of the gravitational waves, as well as the spectrum $\mathcal{P}_{\rho}$ of the density perturbation, and hence determine the ratio

$$R_{\ell} \equiv \langle A_{\ell}^2 |_g \rangle / \langle A_{\ell}^2 |_{\rho} \rangle \quad (9)$$

This is to be evaluated for the relevant scale $k \simeq \ell H_0/2$. The ratio depends only weakly on ℓ in the range $\ell \lesssim 10$ of interest here, for the inflationary models which we shall discuss. We shall therefore drop the subscript ℓ .

The effect of R is to multiply the upper bound on the density perturbation implied by a given cmb anisotropy by a factor $(1+R)^{-1/2}$, which multiplies Eq. (8) by a factor $(1+R)^{1/2}$ and tightens the bound on the spectral index n . This has recently been emphasised in connection with the COBE data by Salopek [13], who calculated the effect of gravitational waves numerically. Here we give a simple analytic formula for R , and also the spectral index n , in terms of the inflaton potential and its first two derivatives. We go on to apply them to models of inflation, including extended inflation.

One generally assumes that the inflaton field ϕ and its potential V satisfy the following ‘slow-roll’ conditions², at the epoch when relevant scales leave the horizon during inflation [15, 3]

$$\dot{\phi} = -\frac{V'}{3H} \quad (10)$$

$$\epsilon \ll 1 \quad (11)$$

$$|\eta| \ll 1 \quad (12)$$

where

$$\epsilon \equiv \frac{m_P^2}{16\pi} \left(\frac{V'}{V} \right)^2 \simeq -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} \quad (13)$$

$$\eta \equiv \frac{m_P^2}{8\pi} \frac{V''}{V} \quad (14)$$

Here H is the Hubble parameter during inflation, equal to $\dot{a}/a$ where a is the scale factor of the universe with present value $a = 1$. We will denote the epoch when inflation ends by a subscript 2, and the epoch $k = aH$ when the scale k^{-1} leaves the horizon by a subscript k . They may be related by equating two expressions for the number $N(t_k)$ of Hubble times before the end of inflation (eg. [16])

$$N(t_k) = \frac{8\pi}{m_P^2} \int_{\phi_k}^{\phi_2} \frac{V}{V'} d\phi = 60 + \ln \frac{V_k^{1/4}}{10^{16} \text{ GeV}} + 2 \ln \frac{V_k^{1/4}}{V_2^{1/4}} - \ln(k/H_0) \quad (15)$$

(The second expression assumes that reheating is prompt, otherwise there is a small correction.) Except in the case of power-law inflation, the end of inflation is supposed to be signalled by the failure of Eq. (11) or Eq. (12),

$$\max\{\epsilon_2, |\eta_2|\} = 1 \quad (16)$$

The spectrum of the adiabatic density perturbation is given by [17]

$$\delta_H^2(k) = \frac{32}{75} \frac{V_k}{m_P^4} \epsilon_k^{-1} \quad (17)$$

²For power-law inflation exact results will be mentioned later.

Using Eq. (10), the effective spectral index on a given scale is therefore given by

$$1 - n = -\frac{d \ln[\delta_H^2(k)]}{d \ln k} = (6\epsilon_k - 2\eta_k) \quad (18)$$

The spectrum of the canonically normalised gravitational wave amplitude is the same as that of any other massless scalar field [19]

$$\mathcal{P}_g(k) \simeq \left(\frac{H_k}{2\pi}\right)^2 \simeq \frac{2}{3\pi} \frac{V_k}{m_P^2} \quad (19)$$

Its effective spectral index is given by

$$n_g = -\frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_g}{d \ln k} = 2\epsilon_k \quad (20)$$

When it is small, the correction to Eqs. (17) and (19) is of order $\max\{\epsilon_k, |\eta_k|\}$ [18], which is usually of order $|1 - n|$.

Using Eq. (7) on the appropriate scale, the density contribution to the cmb anisotropy is

$$\frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{2\ell+1} \langle A_\ell^2|_\rho \rangle \simeq \frac{4}{75} \frac{V_k}{m_P^4} \epsilon_k^{-1} \quad (21)$$

The gravitational contribution is given by [20]

$$\frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{2\ell+1} \langle A_\ell^2|_g \rangle \simeq \frac{8}{27} \left(1 + \frac{48\pi^2}{385}\right) C_\ell \frac{V_k}{m_P^4} \quad (22)$$

In these expressions $k \simeq \ell H_0/2$, the scale dominating the ℓ th multipole, and the correction factor C_ℓ in the second expression is equal to 1 for $\ell \gg 1$, with $C_2 = 1.1$. They lead to the ratio

$$R = 12.4 C_\ell \epsilon_k \simeq 12.4 \epsilon_k \quad (23)$$

Since $\epsilon = -\dot{H}/H^2$, we see that the gravitational contribution is negligible if and only if inflation is almost exponential.

4. Inflationary models.

Let us use these expressions to calculate R , n_g and n , for the usually considered types of inflaton potential. We need them only for the few Hubble times following the epoch when the scale $k = H_0$ leaves the horizon, which we will denote by a subscript 1, which for the potentials considered here means that they are practically scale independent.

‘Chaotic’ inflation [15] employs a potential $V \propto \phi^\alpha$. From Eqs. (15) and (16) one learns that $\phi_1^2 \simeq 120\alpha m_P^2/8\pi$. This leads to $1 - n = (2 + \alpha)/120$ and $R = .05\alpha$, in excellent agreement with Salopek’s numerical results [13]. With the usual choices ϕ^2 and ϕ^4 , n is very close to 1. The ratio R is respectively .1 and .2, which is similar to the cosmic variance with a 10^0 resolution. One therefore needs a better resolution to detect the gravitational waves in this model.

Power-law inflation [21, 22] employs a potential

$$V \propto \exp\left(\sqrt{\frac{16\pi}{p}} \frac{\phi}{m_P}\right) \quad (24)$$

corresponding to a scale factor $a \propto t^p$ where t is the time during inflation. From Eqs. (18) and (20), the spectral indices are given by $n_g = 1 - n = 2/p$; they are independent of scale so that the spectra have a genuine power law dependence. The ratio R is equal to $\simeq 12.4/p$. The value of $Rp/12.5$ for $\ell = 2$ can be read off Figure 2 of [24]. It is within 10% or so of unity for $.6 < n < 1$, so in this range we feel confident in setting $R = 12/p$ for all ℓ . As shown in Figure 1, this leads to the bound $n > 0.84$, at the 2-sigma level separately on each piece of data. (In calculating these curves we have used the exact expressions $n_g = 1 - n = 2/(p - 1)$ [21, 22, 23].)

The inclusion of gravitational waves has tightened the bound on $1 - n$ by a factor of 2, and made it impossible to fit the APM data! A similar conclusion was reached recently in a more qualitative fashion by Salopek [13]. Note also how rapidly this bound improves if the true result is not at the top of the COBE 2-sigma range. For instance, were the COBE result to prove exactly right then the bound would be around $n > 0.9$.

It is, however, possible to generate a power-law spectrum with negligible gravitational radiation; this is achieved by the ‘natural’ inflation [25] potential

$$V \propto [1 + \cos(\phi/f)] \quad (25)$$

Eqs. (15) and (16) determine ϕ_1/f . We assume that $f < m_P$, and in this regime $\phi_1/f \ll \pi$ so that

$$1 - n \simeq \frac{m_P^2}{8\pi} \frac{1}{f^2} \quad (26)$$

$$R \simeq \frac{3}{16\pi} \frac{m_P^2 \phi^2}{f^4} \quad (27)$$

With $f = m_P$ one has $n = .96$ and $R = .02$. As f decreases, R decreases very rapidly, for instance $R \sim 10^{-5}$ for $f = .5m_P$. Thus R is indeed negligible. At the minimum allowed value $f = .3m_P$, $n = .5$ so it seems possible to have $n \simeq .6$ in this model. Note however that the corrections to Eqs. (17) and (21) have yet to be calculated, in contrast with the power-law case.

The normalisation of a given inflationary potential is determined by the normalisation of $\mathcal{P}_\rho$, for instance Eq. (4). In all cases one has $V_2^{1/4} < V_1^{1/4} \lesssim 10^{16}$ GeV, where $k \sim H_0$ is the largest relevant scale [26, 16, 23, 14]. For the following discussion of extended inflation we will need an upper limit on $V_2^{1/4}$ in the case of power-law inflation. We have calculated it using the exact results of [23] with the 2-sigma limit of Eq. (4), and the result is plotted in Figure 2.

5. Extended inflation.

Extended inflation [27, 28] reintroduces the original concept [29] of inflation driven

by a first-order phase transition, brought to an end by bubble nucleation. The Lagrangian to which it corresponds can be written either in the ‘Jordan frame’ where the matter terms are canonical or the ‘Einstein frame’ where gravity is canonical, the two ‘frames’ being related by a conformal transformation of the metric. The Jordan frame is the most convenient after inflation, and also during inflation when one is considering an ordinary scalar field such as the axion, but the Einstein frame is the one in which to calculate the spectra $\mathcal{P}_\rho$ and $\mathcal{P}_g$ [30, 31].

The original version of extended inflation was based on a Jordan–Brans–Dicke theory, characterised by a mass scale M , and the Brans–Dicke parameter ω . It was quickly ruled out [32, 33], because the upper limit on ω during inflation, to be discussed in a minute, is far below the value required at present by time-delay tests of general relativity [34]. A succession of improved models has been provided to circumvent this difficulty [33, 35, 36, 37]. Many of these leave inflation unchanged, merely shielding ω from present day observation by invoking some mechanism to make the Einstein and Jordan frames coincide quickly after inflation ends. Such models include those where a potential is introduced for the Brans–Dicke field [33], amongst others [35]. Let us consider them first.

In the Einstein frame they correspond to power-law inflation with $n = (2\omega - 9)/(2\omega - 1)$ and $V_2^{1/4} = M$. An upper bound on n follows from the fact that the effect of bubbles forming during the early stages of inflation has not been seen in the microwave sky. It is taken from a detailed calculation by Liddle and Wands [38], following heuristic analyses by several authors [32, 33]. In [38] the initial bubble spectrum was calculated, incorporating evolution from the end of inflation to the last scattering surface and the expected anisotropy in specific experiments was analysed. The constraint arose from a combination of experimental sky coverage and the ability to resolve small bubbles, and the most efficient constraint was found to come from the then-current COBE results based on the first six months of observations [39], assuming pixel-to-pixel variations of no more than 10^{-4} . In fact, it is not clear that the new COBE data have much improved this, as the signal is a few (~ 3) bright spots somewhere on the microwave sky, and they may be susceptible to shielding by the galaxy or misidentification as sources in the data reduction. In any case, the constraint is only a weak function of the void resolvability, so we conclude the constraint given then is still the best available, while noting that it is likely to be extremely conservative, as discussed in [38].

The bubble constraint is plotted in Figure 2, assuming that the dark matter is cold. It depends weakly on the matter content of the universe, and for comparison the effect of taking instead pure hot dark matter is also shown. As at most a small admixture of hot dark matter is allowed cosmologically, the true result is nearer to the cold dark matter result. Also, with the addition of any hot dark matter free-streaming removes yet further short-scale power relative to the large-scale power detected by COBE to which we are normalising, which makes the velocity data even harder to reconcile. Combined with the constraint on M one sees that $n \lesssim .75$, which rules out

these models.

More general models, in which ω becomes dynamical, have to be examined in their own light. For example, where one simply sets $\omega = \omega(\Phi)$ [36], it has been shown [40] that the bubble constraint is substantially stronger than one's naive expectation that the normal constraint on ω would apply at the epoch where the large bubbles are formed. On the other hand, the hyperextended model [37] can be arranged such that the phase transition completes via the expansion becoming subluminal rather than by an increasing nucleation rate. It thus evades big bubbles in an unusual way, but detailed calculations extending [40] would have to be carried out to investigate whether the spectrum of density fluctuations could be made flat enough, and the gravitational wave contribution sufficiently small, that a satisfactory model could be arranged.

Note added in proof: Since completing this work, we have received three further preprints [41] discussing the possible role of gravitational waves on the microwave background. Where we overlap, our results are in good agreement. None of these papers however exhibits explicit constraints on power-law models, or discusses the viability of extended inflation in that light. Finally, we have also received a preprint from Crittenden and Steinhardt [42] which addresses many of the questions concerning hyperextended inflation which we raised in our final paragraph.

Acknowledgements

We thank Ed Copeland, Rocky Kolb, Josh Frieman, Jim Lidsey, David Salopek, Paul Steinhardt, Ewan Stewart and Andy Taylor for helpful discussions and comments. ARL is supported by the SERC, and acknowledges the use of the STARLINK computer system at the University of Sussex.

References

- [1] G F Smoot *et al*, "Structure in the COBE DMR First Year Maps", NASA preprint (1992)
- [2] P J E Peebles, *The Large Scale Structure of the Universe*, (Princeton University Press, 1980).
- [3] G Boerner, *The Early Universe* (Springer, Berlin 1988); E W Kolb and M S Turner, *The Early Universe* (Addison-Wesley, 1990).
- [4] G Efstathiou in "The Physics of the Early Universe", eds A Heavens, J Peacock and A Davies, SUSSP publications (1990).
- [5] G Efstathiou, J R Bond and S D M White, "COBE Background Radiation Anisotropies and Large Scale Structure in the Universe", Oxford preprint (1992).

- [6] A N Taylor and M Rowan-Robinson, “Cosmological Constraints on the Spectrum of Density Fluctuations from COBE and QDOT”, QMW preprint (June 1992).
- [7] W Saunders *et al*, *Nature* **349** (1991) 32.
- [8] E Bertschinger and A Dekel, *Astrophys J Lett* **336** (1989) L5.
E Bertschinger, A Dekel, S M Faber, A Dressler and D Burstein, *Astrophys J* **364** (1990) 370.
- [9] W Saunders, M Rowan-Robinson and A Lawrence, “The Spatial Correlation Function of IRAS Galaxies on Small and Intermediate Scales”, QMW preprint, to appear, *Mon Not Roy astr Soc*.
- [10] J R Bond and G Efstathiou, *Mon Not Roy astr Soc* **226** (1987) 655.
- [11] P J E Peebles, *Astrophys J* **263** (1982) L1.
- [12] R Scaramella and N Vittorio, *Astrophys J* **353** (1990) 372.
- [13] D S Salopek, “Consequences of the COBE Satellite for the Inflationary Scenario”, DAMTP preprint (June 1992).
- [14] A R Liddle, D H Lyth and W Sutherland, *Phys Lett* **B279** (1992) 244.
A R Liddle and D H Lyth, “The Spectral Slope in the Cold Dark Matter Cosmogony”, Sussex preprint SUSSEX-AST 92/8-1 (August 1992).
- [15] A D Linde, *Particle Physics and Cosmology*, (Gordon and Breach, 1990).
- [16] D H Lyth, *Phys Lett* **B246** (1990) 359.
- [17] S W Hawking, *Phys Lett* 115B, 295 (1982).
A A Starobinsky, *Phys Lett* 117B, 175 (1982).
A Guth and S-Y Pi, *Phys Rev Lett* 49, 1110 (1982).
J M Bardeen, P S Steinhardt and M S Turner, *Phys Rev* D28, 679 (1983).
The numerical coefficient was first given in D H Lyth, *Phys Rev* **D31** (1985) 1792.
- [18] D H Lyth and E D Stewart, in preparation.
- [19] A Vilenkin and L H Ford, *Phys Rev* **D25** (1982) 1231.
A D Linde, *Phys Lett* **B116** (1982) 335.
A A Starobinsky, *Phys Lett* **B117** (1982) 175.
- [20] A A Starobinsky, *Sov Astron Lett* **11** (1985) 113.
- [21] L F Abbott and M B Wise, *Nucl Phys* **B244** (1984) 541.
- [22] F Lucchin and S Matarrese, *Phys Rev* **D32** (1985) 1316.

- [23] D H Lyth and E D Stewart, *Phys Lett* **B274** (1992) 168.
- [24] R Fabbri, F Lucchin and S Matarrese, *Phys Lett* **B166** (1986) 49.
- [25] K Freese, J A Frieman and A V Olinto, *Phys Rev Lett* **65** (1989) 3233.
J A Frieman, personal communication.
- [26] D H Lyth, *Phys Lett* **B196** (1987) 126.
- [27] D La and P J Steinhardt, *Phys Rev Lett* **62** (1989) 376.
- [28] E W Kolb, *Physica Scripta* **T36** (1991) 199.
- [29] A H Guth, *Phys Rev D* **23** (1981) 347.
- [30] D H Lyth and E D Stewart, *Phys Rev D* **46**, 532 (1992).
- [31] E W Kolb, D S Salopek and M S Turner, *Phys Rev D* **42** (1990) 3925.
A H Guth and B Jain, *Phys Rev D* **45**, 428 (1992).
- [32] E J Weinberg, *Phys Rev D* **40** (1989) 3950.
- [33] D La, P J Steinhardt and E Bertschinger, *Phys Lett* **B231** (1989) 231.
- [34] R D Reasenberg *et al*, *Astrophys J Lett* **234** (1979) L219.
- [35] R Holman, E W Kolb and Y Wang, *Phys Rev Lett* **65** (1990) 17.
R Holman, E W Kolb, S Vadas and Y Wang, *Phys Lett* **B269** (1991) 252.
- [36] J D Barrow and K Maeda, *Nucl Phys* **B341** (1990) 294.
- [37] P J Steinhardt and F S Accetta, *Phys Rev Lett* **64** (1990) 2740.
- [38] A R Liddle and D Wands, *Mon Not Roy astr Soc* **253** (1991) 637.
- [39] G F Smoot *et al*, *Astrophys J Lett* **371** (1991) L1.
- [40] A R Liddle and D Wands, *Phys Rev D* **45** (1992) 2665.
- [41] R L Davis, H M Hodges, G F Smoot, P J Steinhardt and M S Turner, “Cosmic Microwave Background Probes Models of Inflation”, Fermilab preprint FERMILAB-PUB-92/168-A (June 1992).
F Lucchin, S Matarrese and S Mollerach, “The Gravitational-Wave Contribution to CMB Anisotropies and the Amplitude of Mass Fluctuations from COBE results”, Fermilab preprint FERMILAB-PUB-92/185-A (July 1992).
J E Lidsey and P Coles, “Inflation, Gravitational Waves and the Cosmic Microwave Background: Reconciling CDM with COBE?”, QMW preprint (July 1992).

- [42] R Crittenden and P J Steinhardt, “Graceful Exit in Extended Inflation and Implications for Density Perturbations”, Pennsylvania preprint UPR-0510T (1992).

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Constraining the bias.

Spectral slope limits for power-law and extended inflation, based on results from COBE and from IRAS, at 2-sigma exclusion both above and below. The COBE bound includes the effect of gravitational waves. We take the limit as $n > 0.84$; however, note the sensitivity of the limit if the true fluctuations are well below the COBE upper limit.

Figure 2. Extended inflation parameter space.

This figure shows the allowed regions of the ω - M parameter plane for extended inflation, in the light of limits on big bubbles and on microwave fluctuations. The inflaton potential at the end of inflation is M^4 , and the spectral index is $n = (2\omega - 9)/(2\omega - 1)$. The microwave constraint applies also to power-law inflation.